

INCOMING TELEGRAM

Department of State

ACTION COPY

53

SECRET

Action

One / Buffer

Control: 11048

Rec'd: FEBRUARY 18, 1959

8:13 PM

BUC 20

FROM: NEW YORK

Info

RMR

TO: Secretary of State

SS

NO: 679, FEBRUARY 18, 7 PM

W

G

SP

C

L

INR

H

LIMITED DISTRIBUTION

RE: BERLIN

IN CONNECTION DEPARTMENT'S CONSIDERATION POSSIBLE USE UN AS ELEMENT  
IN OUR POLICY IN BERLIN, I WISH MAKE FOLLOWING COMMENTS:

1. ACTION IN UN PRIOR TO USE OF FORCE WOULD MAKE SUCH USE MORE  
DIFFICULT AND POSSIBLY PREVENT IT SUBSEQUENTLY, YET FORCE MAY BE  
ONLY WAY KEEP OUR LINES TO BERLIN OPEN. DOUBTFUL WE CAN GET VOTES  
FOR STRONG ENOUGH RESOLUTION TO JUSTIFY USE OF FORCE LATER.  
FEAR IS TOO GREAT AMONG UN REPRESENTATIVES OF ANY ACTION, HOWEVER  
JUSTIFIED, WHICH MIGHT BRING CLASH BETWEEN SOVIET UNION AND US.

2. BRINGING BERLIN ISSUE TO UN WILL INEVITABLY LEAD TO ATTEMPTS  
COMPROMISE. IF WE REBUFF THESE ATTEMPTS, REJECT COMPROMISE, AND  
PARTICULARLY IF WE USE FORCE TO MAINTAIN RIGHT OF ACCESS WHILE UN  
PROCESSES GOING ON, ONUS MAY SHIFT TO US AND WE APPEAR  
BE DISTURBERS OF PEACE REJECTING UN PROCEDURES.

3. IF WE SEE POSSIBILITY OF COMPROMISE ACCEPTABLE US, SC MIGHT  
PROVIDE GOOD FORUM IN WHICH DEVELOP IT PRIOR USE OF FORCE.  
HOWEVER, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, OUR POLICY IS TO REFUSE ANY COMPROMISE  
ON OUR RIGHTS OF ACCESS AND TO USE NECESSARY FORCE TO MAINTAIN  
RIGHT. IN THAT CASE, FROM STANDPOINT OF UN ACTION, WE WOULD BE  
BETTER POSITION IF WE USE WHAT FORCE IS NECESSARY AS SOON AS  
FIRST GDR CHALLENGE COMES. SIMULTANEOUSLY WE SHOULD TAKE ISSUE  
TO SC, STATING OUR CASE AND REPORTING WHAT WE HAVE DONE.

4. IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES SC ACTION WOULD HAVE PROCEED FROM FACT

OUR



CLASSIFIED FILE

UNLESS "UNCLASSIFIED"  
REPRODUCTION FROM THIS  
COPY IS PROHIBITED.

PERMANENT  
RECORD COPY • This copy must be returned to RM/R central files with notation of action taken.

SECRET

Date

4/18/59

Name

and

Date

4/18/59

Name

and

Date

4/18/59

Name

and

Date

4/18/59

Name

and

Date

4/18/59

001040-67

Copy No (s) 11  
Destroyed 11/1/59  
Name and Date

SECRET

-2- 679, FEBRUARY 18, 7 PM, FROM NEW YORK.

500' OUR TEMPORARY CONTROL OF ACCESS TO ASSURE OUR RIGHTS. WE COULD FOCUS SC ATTENTION ON EASING IMMEDIATE CRISIS. WE WOULD THEREBY AVOID UN ATTEMPT AT COMPROMISE ON OVERALL WESTERN AND RUSSIAN POSITIONS IN BERLIN. WE COULD, FOR EXAMPLE, INTRODUCE RESOLUTION CALLING. FOR CEASE-FIRE AND RETURN TO STATUS QUO ANTE OF FOUR POWER CONTROL AND ALSO FOR FOUR POWER TALKS, POSSIBLY WITHIN SC FRAMEWORK.

5. AS REGARDS UN ASPECTS, PARALLEL IS VERY CLOSE BETWEEN PRESENT CASE AND SITUATION WE FACED LAST SUMMER OVER LEBANON, ALTHOUGH IN CASE OF BERLIN WE CAN BASE OURSELVES ON ACKNOWLEDGED PRIOR RIGHTS TO WHICH THERE WAS NO COUNTERPART IN LEBANON. WE WOULD NEVER HAVE GOTTEN UN AUTHORIZATION IN ADVANCE TO SEND OUR TROOPS TO LEBANON.

6. FOLLOWING SUCH AN APPEAL TO SC WE WOULD TAKE ALL POSSIBLE STEPS AVOID IMMEDIATE EMERGENCY GA, FOR WHICH STRONG PRESSURE WOULD DEVELOP, EVEN WITHIN SC MEMBERSHIP. IN GA, PRESSURES FOR ALMOST ANY KIND COMPROMISE COULD WELL BECOME SO OVERWHELMING AS TO JEOPARDIZE US BEST INTERESTS.

7. WE COULD STALL OFF EMERGENCY GA IN TWO WAYS. FIRST, SEVERAL PROPOSALS FOR UN ACTION COULD BE INITIATED BY OURSELVES AND OTHERS WHICH SC WOULD HAVE CONSIDER CONSECUTIVELY, REQUIRING SEVERAL DAYS, AND THUS GIVING US TIME CONSOLIDATE SITUATION IN AREA BEFORE GA CALLED. SECOND, WE COULD CONTINUE WITHIN SC PRESS FOR FOUR POWER MEETING.

8. SUCH INITIATIVES IN COUNCIL, ESPECIALLY CALLS FOR FOUR POWER TALKS, WOULD APPEAR AS EFFORT SHIFT DISPUTE BACK ONTO DIPLOMATIC PLANE, IN ACCORD WITH OVERWHELMING DESIRE UN MEMBERS PREVENT SPREAD OF CONFLICT.

9. WE COULD INCREASE APPARENT FLEXIBILITY OUR POSITION AND INCREASE IMPACT OUR PROPOSAL FOR FOUR POWER CONFERENCE IF WE WERE ALSO WILLING SUGGEST POSSIBILITY HEADS OF STATE MEETING ALSO WITHIN SC FRAMEWORK TO FOLLOW SUCCESSFUL FOREIGN MINISTERS CONFERENCES AS WE

SUGGESTED

SECRET

901040 -68

~~SECRET~~

-3- 679, FEBRUARY 18, 7 PM, FROM NEW YORK.

SUGGESTED LAST SUMMER. THIS WAS A GOOD FORMULA WHICH, IF PROPERLY APPLIED, WOULD NOT HAVE ENDANGERED OUR INTERESTS.

10. THUS, WE WOULD HAVE INITIATIVE IN SEEKING PEACEFUL SOLUTION, WHILE ACTUALLY ENFORCING OUR RIGHT OF ACCESS TO BERLIN. WE WOULD ALSO HAVE INITIATIVE ON SUMMIT ISSUE THROUGH PROCEDURE WE COULD CONTROL.

11. FROM POINT OF VIEW OF MAINTAINING BEST PUBLIC POSTURE FOR POSSIBLE UN ACTION, I ALSO AGREE WITH BERLIN'S 680 THAT WE HAVE CLEARER SITUATION IF NO DOCUMENTS SHOWN GDR OFFICIALS AT ALL. WE MUST KEEP FOCUS ON MAIN ISSUE, NAMELY WHETHER OR NOT SOVIETS UNILATERALLY CAN TRANSFER TO GDR CONTROL OF OUR ACCESS TO BERLIN IN VIOLATION OUR RIGHTS AND AGAINST OUR PROTESTS. WE MUST STAND DIRECTLY ON PRINCIPLE IN SUCH WAY THAT OUR ACTIONS CANNOT BE MISINTERPRETED AS QUIBBLING. WE MUST NOT LET SOVIET ENTANGLE MAIN ISSUE IN DEBATE BY MAKING IT APPEAR "WESTERN POWERS RISKING WAR OVER LEGAL TECHNICALITY OF PROCESSING DOCUMENTS."

LODGE

SLS/21

CLASSIFIED FILE

~~SECRET~~

901040-69